

When is television going to provide us with the wholesome and happy entertainment, and the human dramas that do not depend upon a gun or a handkerchief for a solution?

More and more Americans are disturbed by the failure of television to develop its true potentialities.

As an example of that mounting criticism, I recommend for your consideration the following forthright editorial titled "Togetherness," from the August 2 issue of the Lawrence Sunday Sun, published in Lawrence, Mass.:

TOGETHERNESS

There's a word that's beginning to grind on our nerves. It's that increasingly used and increasingly trite "togetherness."

Supposedly, it is descriptive of a cozy condition involving a family or other group in which everyone has the same objectives. That's all very well and good. We like the idea of affinity so long as it is on the proper side of the social ledger.

Togetherness has a variety of applications. In one sense, it has a most acceptable definition when it pertains to the family. It also is pertinent to community effort for the public weal.

But when you apply togetherness to industries like television, you encounter a maze of conflict.

Not of late, but for years, there has been a relentless bombardment of television programs which are anything but contributory to the welding of that tight little knot known as the family group.

There is too much glorification of crime and criminals on television. The so-called "dramatic" programs inevitably reach a climax in which the baddie gets his just desserts. But in the denouement of the story there is altogether too much instruction beamed at youth in how crimes are planned and perpetrated—no matter what the outcome might be in the last few seconds of the story.

Some of the westerns are bad enough, both in acting and plot. But the detective stories could bear a bit of cleaning up—if not in the acting division then in the mechanics of presenting a script in which the baddie is a hero until he is unmasked, disgraced and punished.

The principal audience for these crime stories is made of adolescents. Mom and Dad usually go for the song-and-dance type of entertainment, or for the tear-jerking soap operas. But to what is classed as impressionable youth, the crime yarns have the greater appeal.

What is particularly disturbing in the situation is that there does not appear to be any way of stopping pictorial descriptions of such things as Chicago infamous St. Valentine's Day massacre and other stories whether historic or imaginary, which glorify brutality.

Can you think of one evening that has gone by without some "private eye" being beaten up, gun-whipped, ambushed or otherwise shot and lacerated on your TV screen. This is fun? This is stuff for adolescents, for children, to see by the hour? Is it fun to expose them to lessons in the fine art of mayhem and slaughter?

The answer to criticism would be that "the public goes for it—look at our Hooper rating."

Who in hell—if you will pardon the expression—is Hooper? Is he, or she, or an agency under that name, the guardian of the mentality and morals of your children?

Has any Hooper or any other person ever called you to inquire whether you are watching a certain program in your home? The answer in millions of cases would be, naturally, "no." Then what hold does Hooper have on the television industry?

There must be some means by which all of us can be restored to some position of normalcy in the television field. There is a lot of complaint about the advertising. It's a necessary evil. Giving credit where credit is due, we have never seen Josephine Hennessey take a drink of the alcoholic beverage she extolls between innings of a ball game. Were it not for sponsors who pay the bills for the broadcasts there would be few of our favorite programs on our living-room screens.

But it's time we let sponsors know that we are tired of the endless blood-letting and killing that goes on, for hours on end, in these TV programs.

Somewhere, somehow, they can find writers who can whip up a spanking new technique which will give us—and our children—something of a vacation from the endless grind of battle, murder, and sudden death which causes our homes to sound like a Coney Island shooting gallery every day of the week—Sunday included.

We can thank goodness for baseball and football for lifting the pressure during their proper seasons. The rest of the time is what bothers us.

And those repeat programs. Would you sit down and read the same book twice, thrice, or four times in a year? Would you bother with your newspaper or magazine if it repeated its stories, edition after edition? Television is basically a good medium of entertainment. Let's stick with the base.

PUBLICITY DECISIVE?

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

(Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, recent publicity given by the press, TV, and radio to the reprehensible, illegal practices carried on by Reuther, Beck, Hoffa, and a few other professional, criminal, labor leaders has finally forced Congress to consideration of remedial legislation.

Mail now indicates that politicians whose fetish is political expediency will be forced to decide that it is politically advantageous to join the parade of the comparative few who, ever since the sit-down strikes of 1937, have been trying to give notice that the political and economic dictatorship sought by a few unscrupulous and ambitious individuals was making rapid progress toward the overthrow of our accepted economic governmental processes. It is time to stop, look, and act.

Because labor—employees—has consistently been regarded as having less opportunity and wealth resources than those who provided jobs, labor has had the sympathy and support of legislators.

The McClellan and other congressional committees, and a few Members of Congress who have complained for years, have finally focused public attention upon abuses practiced by a few labor organizations which have been controlled and directed by individuals referred to above.

There are now in the legislative hopper many bills seeking a remedy.

The House Committee on Education and Labor reported out a weakened

Kennedy-Ervin bill. Republicans on that committee, as well as three or four Democrats, sought a more comprehensive and stronger bill, but they did not, in committee, for political reasons, offer a substitute.

Later, one or two Democrats and a Republican or two secretly joined in asking legislative experts to put together a substitute bill. The result was the Landrum-Griffin bill, in the main—a collection of excerpts from bills previously introduced, which was more stringent and tougher, more effective than the Elliott—formerly the Kennedy-Ervin—bill. The substitute provisions were carefully concealed from committee members and the public. Why?

The substitute carried many of the provisions of bills introduced by me years ago, but which were refused consideration by the leadership of the House, both Republican and Democrat, because it was then said they were anti-labor—a misnomer.

The substitute does not contain any provision designed to prevent monopolistic practices by unions as they are by industry. It does not prevent the closed shop where a would-be employee must pay tribute in order to earn a livelihood. It does not carry any provision similar to a Michigan statute—the Hutchinson Act—which would bar strikes against public utilities which furnish us with the necessities of life, and where an effective strike would be a complete blackout—prevent the furnishing of transportation, light, water, and power.

The foregoing is stated because this last week, due to the publicity just mentioned, which has undoubtedly made the average citizen cognizant of what has happened, many letters have come to me asking that I support the substitute bill—the writers evidently having forgotten that for more than 20 years I have been advocating—perhaps too often—every good feature it contains.

Twenty-two years and four months ago, April 5, 1937, a bill containing many of the provisions of the bill I am now asked to support was introduced by me. An amendment bill, more fully defining the term "affecting commerce," was introduced on April 15, 1937.

I can only answer that I am anxious and pleased to support similar remedial legislation, to express appreciation to the publicity agencies which have brought about the changed attitude of the public, and to hope that the professional politicians and office-seekers, whose affairs I am glad to stand on the sidelines and cheer, will not have a change of mind before effective legislation is on the books.

It is also my prayerful hope that, when on the books, officers charged with the enforcement of the law—and I am thinking of the Department of Justice—will then enthusiastically and effectively enforce that legislation; that home folks will support local officers who enforce the law.

I yield back the balance of my time.

MORTGAGE RELIEF IN DISTRESSED AREAS

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CURTIN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

(Mr. CURTIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CURTIN. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4796 which I introduced on February 19 of this year sets forth a formula to provide much-needed temporary relief from the pressure of FHA-insured and VA-guaranteed mortgages in distress cases where extraordinary circumstances prevail. It accomplishes this by permitting a 1-year moratorium on such mortgages, with the Federal Government assuming the required mortgage payments—both principal and interest—for mortgagors. Such relief would apply only to individuals in economically depressed areas who are unemployed and unable to make payments through no fault of their own.

Millions more of our people today own homes than ever before. The strides which have been made in the field of home financing are a tribute to the administrative efficiency and dedicated work of the Federal agencies concerned with this program, as well as our private institutions.

Even while recognizing this excellent record, I think it is essential that we also keep in mind the fact that these Federal agencies work under a mandate laid down by the very legislative processes with which we are dealing at this moment. Thus it is that when we find a law too unyielding and harsh in its lack of flexibility for dealing with situations that involve human problems, it is the responsibility of Congress to correct such inequities. It is for the express intent of avoiding foreclosure of a temporarily unemployed individual's mortgage by any of our Federal mortgage agencies—assuming that the individual is unemployed through no fault of his own and is a resident of an economically depressed area—that I have introduced this bill.

This bill spells out the term "economically depressed area" on any given date to mean an industrial area in which there has existed unemployment of not less than (A) 15 percent of the labor force during the 6-month period immediately preceding such date, if the principal causes of such unemployment are determined not to be temporary in nature; or (B) 12 percent of the labor force during the 12-month period immediately preceding such date; or (C) 9 percent of the labor force during at least 15-months of the 18-month period immediately preceding such date; or (D) 6 percent of the labor force during at least 18 months of the 24-month period immediately preceding such date.

The bill further specifies that determinations of the duration and amount of unemployment, in a given industrial area shall be made by the Secretary of Labor and certified to the Federal mortgage agencies not less often than quarterly. The Secretary of Labor may also certify to such agencies, as an economically depressed area, any industrial area

within the United States—even though it does not meet the requirements I have just described in my preceding remarks—which is determined by him to be an area in which there has existed substantial and persistent unemployment for an extended period of time.

H.R. 4796 defines the term "unemployed mortgagor" to mean "any individual who is a mortgagor under a mortgage securing a loan, if the appropriate Federal mortgage agency determines that such loan is—or is likely to be—in default because such individual, although willing and able to work, is unemployed through no fault of his own."

I want to underscore the fact that this bill provides a moratorium on payments for just 1 year. Said moratorium may be terminated earlier on a date on which the mortgagor ceases to be unemployed, or on a date on which the mortgagor becomes in default or with respect to a condition or covenant other than that required for payment of installments of principal and interest in specified amounts and at stated times. After any individual is permitted a 1-year moratorium, a Federal mortgage agency may not again assume or suspend the obligation of such individual under any other mortgage. In other words, relief may be obtained by any individual for just one time and is limited to 1 year. It should also be noted that the mortgagor is ultimately required to repay the obligation after the regular maturity date of the mortgage.

Mr. Speaker, this is a measure that is humanitarian in purpose. There are certain economically depressed areas in our Nation—fortunately they are few—in which reside unemployed individuals who through no fault of their own are unemployed and unable to make payments on mortgages insured under the National Housing Act or secured by home loan agreement under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 or chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code. It should be evident that relief for just 1 year from the pressure of mortgage payments is a tender of help to a man with a family at a time when he needs that kind of help the most.

There have been some unhappy examples of mortgage foreclosures in economically depressed areas which should and could have been averted had there been legislation providing for a procedure such as my bill proposes to establish. My own district has witnessed some of these occurrences, in which the Federal mortgage agency brought foreclosure action in line with the literal and legal requirements of the law.

Because of my concern with respect to this problem, you may recall that I proposed an amendment to S. 57 on this floor on May 20, when the housing bill was being debated. That amendment, by and large, would have accomplished a similar purpose so far as foreclosures on FHA mortgages were involved.

Events since that time have demonstrated the continuing importance of having such a provision inserted into our existing laws covering the Federal Government's underwriting of mortgages, not only by the FHA, but also by the Veterans' Administration.

This bill is not a handout; it is not a form of charity. Rather, it is a simple, uncomplicated, and humane remedy that can be accepted with dignity by the individual whom it is designed to aid.

Mr. Speaker, I call this matter to the attention of my colleagues at this time in the hope that something will be done before this session of the 86th Congress adjourns. There is still talk and rumor about further action on either the vetoed S. 57 or a new housing bill. Should the latter be decided upon and a new bill on housing come before us this session, I sincerely hope that the provisions of my bill will be incorporated therein for the FHA mortgages, or, failing that, I hope that affirmative action on my bill can be obtained in some other manner.

(Mr. CURTIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

FEIGHAN DEMANDS NIXON REVEAL HIS TALKS WITH KHRUSHCHEV ON THE CAPTIVE NATIONS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the resolution declaring Captive Nations Week unanimously passed both Houses of Congress.

No single act of Congress has commanded so much national and international attention in years. No single action by the Eisenhower administration has won as much acclaim or brought so much credit to our country as that which attaches to the proclamation which the President issued in response to the congressional resolution. In these results there is a lesson, indeed a startling lesson, in the power of human ideals and the rewards that can be ours as a Nation if we remain true to our political ideals and fearless in their propagation.

It was in very large measure coincidental that the passage of this resolution by the Congress, and the proclamation by the President, coincided with the visit of Vice President Nixon to Moscow to open the U.S. exhibition there. But it was a happy coincidence. It was happy because it gave real purpose to the Vice President's trip, it served notice on the Russian leaders that we, the people of the United States, would never substitute cultural exchanges—particularly those like the Kozlov-Nixon exchanges—trade fairs and exhibitions, or international cocktail parties for our political ideals. It reaffirmed our confidence in the popular will of the people of the captive nations as a certain instrument through which they will regain their freedom and national independence. It served notice that the American people will not stand for any deal, no matter how attractive propaganda may paint it to be, with the advocates of tyranny, despotism, and the dismal peace of human slavery. This is the vital message Khrushchev and company received through this action by Congress, the President concurring.

The first reaction of the Russian spokesman, Khrushchev, made upon his return to Moscow from an excursion into

Communist occupied Poland, provides abundant evidence that the captive nations resolution broke up a clambake that had been prepared for the Vice President. Attacking the resolution, Khrushchev said:

They send their Governors here—

Referring to the recent visit of nine U.S. Governors—

They send their Vice President here. They are opening an exhibit here—and then do a thing like this.

From this it is clear that the Russians believed that we were willing to trade our political ideals for a mess of pottage of nonessentials. It is also clear that by our lack of political action during the past several years we have allowed the Russians to deceive themselves into believing that we would be willing to turn our backs on the captive nations if they would go through the motions of appearing somewhat reformed after the death of Stalin. What a tragedy it would have been if the Vice President had walked into the well-prepared Russian political clambake with his hosts laboring under this serious miscalculation. The consequences would have been far reaching and the results disastrous for the cause of human freedom. I say this because the massive propaganda machine of the Russians would have carried these miscalculations, now so apparent, to a point where it would be most difficult, if not impossible, for our country to extract itself from the trap.

So it is that the captive nations resolutions set the proper stage for the talks between the Vice President and Khrushchev. I refer of course to the private, off the record talks which took place after the scene at the Moscow exhibit. The people of the United States will await with interest a report by the Vice President as to what he told Khrushchev in private about United States intention toward the captive nations. We can be certain that this was one of the main points of discussion because Khrushchev has practically talked about nothing else since the arrival of the Vice President in Moscow. Khrushchev has been denouncing the purpose of the resolution and it will be of continuing public interest to hear from the Vice President what he said to Khrushchev on this score in their private chats. In this connection I should like to note that the Vice President has made no public statements on this basic issue up to this point of his tour of the Russian Federated Soviet Socialist Republic.

A number of erroneous statements have been made concerning the itinerary of the Vice President which I feel should be corrected. In the first place he did not tour the Soviet Union as widely reported in the American press. His tour was restricted to one nation of the Soviet Union—the Russian nation, and then he saw only carefully selected parts of this nation. To create the false impression that Mr. Nixon was on a visit of the Soviet Union is to put his trip all out of proportion to the facts, a situation which might prove embarrassing to our country at a later date. For example, the Russians could claim that they opened

the doors to the Soviet Union for the Vice President—which they have not done.

It is a sad situation that the itinerary of the Vice President did not include visits to the captive nations of the Soviet Union, all of those enumerated in the congressional resolution. I speak of Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, White Ruthenia—Byelorussia—Ukraine, Georgia, Armenia, Azerbaijan, North Caucasus, Turkestan, Cossackia, and Idel-Ural. No one can honestly claim to have visited the Soviet Union without including these captive nations on his itinerary. I realize the Russians would find many reasons for blocking a visit to these nations by the Vice President. However, Mr. Nixon could have properly challenged Khrushchev to go with him on a visit to these Russian occupied countries and there ask the people "Are you captives?" Since Khrushchev first raised the question among the Russians and got the answer he sought, it would have been an act of political wisdom for Mr. Nixon to challenge him to raise the same question among the people of the non-Russian nations of the Soviet Union. After all, they are the majority people of the Soviet Union, not the Russians, and their voice should have been heard on this critical issue.

But then Mr. Nixon may not have been properly briefed on the realities of the Soviet Union before he left. A report of his visit carried in the Wall Street Journal of July 27 indicates that he does not have an accurate picture of the Soviet Union or its people. The Journal reported that while the Vice President was campaigning in Moscow he came across a pretty girl and learned that she was Ukrainian. He promptly proclaimed to the crowd around him, "Look at this pretty Ukrainian girl. Ukraine is the Texas of the Soviet Union." The only similarity between the Ukraine and the State of Texas is that the people of both love liberty and are prepared to fight for it. There the similarity ends. There is no other major similarity between the Ukrainian nation and the great State of Texas. Texas is a voluntary political unit of the United States, whereas Ukraine is not a voluntary unit of the Soviet Union—having been forcibly incorporated therein against the will of the people. Texas is self-governing, electing its officials in free and unfettered elections whereas Ukraine does not enjoy self-government and all officials there are handpicked by the Russian Communists in Russian style elections. Texas has a voice, and I might say a powerful voice, in the Congress and in our Government whereas Ukraine has no voice in the Presidium of the Soviet Union, other than the "parrots" selected by the Russians and even these stooges are allowed nothing more than the opportunity to acclaim whatever Khrushchev and the Russian crowd have decided in advance. The people of Texas speak English, the common language of our country, the people of the Ukraine speak Ukrainian which is not the common language of the Soviet Union because the Soviet Union is a multinational and multilingual empire.

Texas has never been engaged in a state of war against the Federal Government since joining the Union, whereas the people of Ukraine have been engaged in a constant war against the Russian Communists for the past 40-odd years. I have heard no reports of the people of Texas desiring to withdraw from the Union, whereas the people of Ukraine have been attempting to do just that since they were forcibly incorporated into the Soviet Union. Perhaps the Vice President should make a get-acquainted visit to Texas after his return home or hire a better teacher than he had to prepare him for his visit to the Russian Federated Soviet Socialist Republic.

We can be sure that the organs of Russian propaganda will give full treatment to Mr. Nixon's unfortunate remarks about the Ukraine. The effect of his words is to say to the Ukrainians, "We Americans consider you a voluntary and happy part of the Soviet Union and we hope it stays that way forever." Khrushchev and company will take full advantage of this unfortunate quip by Mr. Nixon to offset the favorable impact on public opinion in the Ukraine developed by the captive nations resolution.

Another reaction by Khrushchev to the resolution was his complaint that its passage was unwarranted interference in the internal affairs of other nations. He has been blasting away at this thesis for the past several days. This reaction is reminiscent of a similar protest made by Czar Nicholas in 1905 to a resolution passed by the French Parliament. At that time the first signs of revolution were showing in the Russian Empire; the people were fed up with the despotic and psychotic rulers of the empire and were engaged in a revolt. The French Parliament passed a resolution expressing sympathy for Poland which was then enslaved by the Russians. Czar Nicholas delivered a protest at the French Government, demanding that the French Government stay out of the internal affairs of the Russian Empire. Of course, the French ignored the czar and the tempo of the revolutionary spirit increased within the Russian Empire until it collapsed in 1917 under the pressure of the non-Russian nations in their struggles for their national independence. The Russian Communists have been engaged in wars of aggression for the past 40 years in an effort to restore the old empire. Khrushchev as the new czar has adopted all the traditions of the old czarist regime, including his latest attacks on the captive nations resolution.

But there are positive values and results already apparent from this action by the Congress and the President. Speaking in Ukraine on July 30, Khrushchev had this to say about the Berlin crisis, something entirely new I might add:

If the people of West Berlin wish to live under capitalism, let them. It is their own domestic matter. We do not intend to interfere.

What a change this is from the belligerent statements of this same character when he caused the Berlin crisis and when he attempted to frighten our allies

with the threat of nuclear war unless all of Berlin was handed over to Communist control. It is no coincidence that Khrushchev makes this new proposition on the basis that he would not interfere in the internal affairs of West Berlin. His overriding fear is that we will keep the political initiative which we have won through the captive nations resolution and that pressing our cause for a just peace we will hasten the collapse of the modern day Russian Empire. Thus, he is prepared to pay a price—he will not interfere in the affairs of West Berlin if we will cease and desist in our support of the captive nations. This is the quid pro quo Khrushchev now seeks from us. A mutual pact of noninterference is his objective.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the gentleman on the able speech he is making, a very analytical speech and a very timely speech.

The passage about 2 weeks ago by the Congress of the Captive Nations Week concurrent resolution, which I had the pleasure of offering in the House, and which passed both branches by a unanimous vote, has brought about tremendous favorable reaction in the free world.

As news of the passage of this resolution has been conveyed to the peoples of satellite nations, its passage has brought to tens of millions of persons in Communist-dominated countries, and who despise Communism, intensified hope.

The best evidence that the Kremlin realizes the significance of our action is shown by the violent utterances of Premier Khrushchev of the Soviet Union. The passage of the resolution penetrated deeply the Communist world because Khrushchev and his associates in the world conspiracy know that in Europe alone over 100 million dominated persons despise them and their vicious ideology.

Khrushchev and his associates know these persons are a very weak link in Communist control of those countries, and thereby a powerful reserve and asset we have in case the Soviet Union should undertake to hurl a general war upon mankind.

They know in case of war, at least 100 million persons in Poland, East Germany, Hungary, Lithuania, Czechoslovakia, and other dominated countries, will rise against the Muscovites, and engage in armed resistance, sabotage, and other acts.

That is what you mean by the "Russians"—you mean Moscovites.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Yes, indeed; and I would add another 100 million people in the non-Russian nations of the Soviet Union itself who will rise against the Moscovites.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes. And as I say, at least a hundred million people will rise against the Moscovites and engage in armed resistance, sabotage, and other acts.

And this is one of the strongest assets our country, Great Britain, and France have in any negotiations—if this is stressed in a firm and united manner.

And under no conditions should we enter into any agreement which would in effect constitute selling these people down the river.

For while we cannot now actively capitalize their hatred of communism and the Communists, in case of a general conflict, we could do so effectively.

And the Communist leaders, particularly the military, know that fact.

The screeching of pain by the Communist leaders is evidence of this fact.

Deputy Soviet Prime Minister Kozlov, when he was recently in the United States, had the arrogance to state those governments, Communist regimes, were freely chosen by the people of dominated European countries.

Pravda states the same falsehood.

The resolution we passed challenges the Soviet Union to permit the peoples of those countries to determine what form of government they want, in a free manner, with a secret ballot, and internationally supervised, or supervised by the United Nations.

The Soviet Union would not dare let this happen. Khrushchev and his associates well know that in a free determination of their form of government, the people of those countries would overwhelmingly repudiate, reject and denounce communism.

The resolution the Congress passed was timely. It puts the Soviet Union on the defensive. Our country, France, Great Britain, West Germany, Italy, and other free nations should follow it through by constantly reminding the Kremlin of its broken promises, and by constantly putting on any agenda of negotiations the questions of free elections to determine their own form of government of dominated nations.

The passage of the resolution has strengthened and intensified the hope of over 100 millions of persons for liberty and freedom.

We have hit the Kremlin where it is the weakest.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I congratulate the distinguished majority leader who is one of the outstanding leaders and fighters in the cause of social justice, individual liberty, human freedom, and national independence. I subscribe wholeheartedly to the excellent analysis that you have made of the present situation with reference to the captive nations and the resolution we passed regarding them.

There may well come the time when there will be a spontaneous revolt by all the non-Russian captive nations which the Russians will be unable to put down. The revolts in East Germany in 1953, also in Poznan, Poland, and the Hungarian revolution in October 1956, are instances of separate revolts. If all the captive nations would revolt spontaneously at the same time, the Russians would not be able to keep all of them from attaining their freedom and national independence, which they previously enjoyed before the illegal occupation and takeover by the Russians. This would be doubly true in the event of war.

There is no need for us to pay any price to the Russians for justice in the world order if we remain loyal to our political ideals and vigorous in our propagation of them. The harder we press our current initiative won in the cold war by the Captive Nations Week resolution, the more ground the Russians will be compelled to give up. They have no alternative. They face internal revolution on a scale that will make the revolution of 1917 seem like a Sunday picnic and they know it. We should take new confidence in the power of our political ideals as a deterrent to war and as an instrument in the prosecution of a just and lasting peace for all nations and all men.

I look forward with interest to the return of the Vice President to the United States and his report to the people on his visit to one of the nations of the Soviet Union. No public report will be complete or acceptable by the American people unless he sets the record straight as to the position he took on the Captive Nations Week resolution in his private chats with Khrushchev. To deny that this was the main issue of the conversation would be an affront to the intelligence of the American people. To claim that his conversation on this issue must remain confidential would deprive the American people of information they are entitled to have and to judge on its merits. To withhold a frank and complete report on what he and Khrushchev had to say on this issue will place a dark cloud of doubt over Mr. Nixon's trip and give rise to grave questions about the purpose of the Vice President's visit in the first place.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I yield.

Mr. MONAGAN. I joined with the majority leader at the time this resolution first came up on the floor of the House, and I certainly see no reason at this time so far as I am concerned to have any different opinion now than I had then. It seems to me that the resolution was based on realities and that it represented our philosophy, our national philosophy, toward these captive nations. I do not believe for a moment that the fact that we passed a resolution here in the House of Representatives would have any substantial effect on the policies of the Communist leadership toward these countries. I wonder if the gentleman would not agree with that?

Mr. FEIGHAN. I disagree. The purpose of the resolution was not to try to change the beliefs of the Russian leaders, because as realists we ought to recognize that we cannot change the thinking of the leaders of the Communist conspiracy. It would be ludicrous and ridiculous to think we can change the minds of Khrushchev and the leaders of the Russian Communist conspiracy. The purpose of the resolution was to serve notice on the world that we are in the camp of the anti-imperialists and that we look forward to an era of self-government and national independence for all the countries of the world. This is the positive message of the Captive Nations Week resolution to all the peo-

ple of the world. The resolution reassures the Russians that we will not relax our efforts to bring freedom and national independence to the nations suffering under the yoke of Russian Communist slavery. The resolution was a challenge to the Russians to permit free elections in the captive non-Russian nations to enable them to determine their own destiny as nations.

The Russians illegally occupy and control not only the non-Russian nations within the Soviet Union itself, but also other non-Russian nations of Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Albania, Poland, East Germany, North Korea, North Vietnam, and Tibet.

The Russians should realize that we are persistent in our determination to bring liberation to these captive nations. Because of our resolution the leaders in the Kremlin will not only be hesitant, they will be fearful of starting a war because they will be afraid of uprisings by the captive people.

Mr. MONAGAN. If the gentleman will yield further, it seems to me, too, that when during the Nixon visit Khrushchev was talking to him in the parks and cities about the captive nations and captive people he was pointing out to him Russian people. They saw no non-Russians at any time, no people of Hungary, Poland, or some of these other nations. It seems to me that the omission was very significant.

Mr. FEIGHAN. I certainly agree with the gentleman on that. I said earlier in my remarks that it would have been a part of political wisdom for Mr. Nixon to go with Khrushchev beyond the nation of Russia and go to these other non-Russian nations within the Soviet Union that were forcibly incorporated into the Soviet Union where they would not all be stooges as were those to whom Khrushchev addressed his remarks when he asked them: "Are you captive?"

Mr. Speaker, by unanimously passing the Captive Nations Week resolution, Congress has expressed its firm determination to stand behind the campaign promises of President Eisenhower in his 1952 campaign and his 1956 election campaign when he declared:

The peaceful liberation of captive peoples has been, is, and—until success is achieved—will continue to be a goal of U.S. foreign policy.

I include in my remarks the Captive Nations Week resolution, which reads as follows:

JOINT RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR THE DESIGNATION OF THE THIRD WEEK OF JULY AS "CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK"

Whereas the greatness of the United States is in large part attributable to its having been able, through the democratic process, to achieve a harmonious national unity of its people, even though they stem from the most diverse of racial, religious, and ethnic backgrounds; and

Whereas this harmonious unification of the diverse elements of our free society has led the people of the United States to possess a warm understanding and sympathy for the aspirations of peoples everywhere and to recognize the natural interdependency of the peoples and nations of the world; and

Whereas the enslavement of a substantial part of the world's population by Communist imperialism makes a mockery of the idea of peaceful coexistence between nations and constitutes a detriment to the natural bonds of understanding between the people of the United States and other peoples; and

Whereas since 1918 the imperialistic and aggressive policies of Russian communism have resulted in the creation of a vast empire which poses a dire threat to the security of the United States and of all the free peoples of the world; and

Whereas the imperialistic policies of Communist Russia have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation of the national independence of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, and others; and

Whereas these submerged nations, look to the United States, as the citadel of human freedom, for leadership in bringing about their liberation and independence and in restoring to them the enjoyment of their Christian, Jewish, Moslem, Buddhist, or other religious freedoms, and of their individual liberties; and

Whereas it is vital to the national security of the United States that the desire for liberty and independence on the part of the peoples of these conquered nations should be steadfastly kept alive; and

Whereas the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of the people of these submerged nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to war and one of the best hopes for a just and lasting peace; and

Whereas it is fitting that we clearly manifest to such peoples through an appropriate and official means the historic fact that the people of the United States share with them their aspirations for the recovery of their freedom and independence: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the third week in July 1959 as "Captive Nations Week" and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities. The President is further authorized and requested to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world.

(Mr. FEIGHAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

DISTINGUISHED TEACHERS FROM IRELAND—VISIT OF IRISH TEACHERS, LED BY A DYNAMIC YOUNG IRISH TEACHER, MR. STEPHEN DALY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

(Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, yesterday there came to the Capitol 15 Irish teachers who are visiting the United States as guests of the Department of State and the U.S. Office of Education to learn more about Ameri-

can schools and America. They came to the Capitol as my guests. They watched the proceedings of the House for some time and said they were much impressed with our legislative procedures. Our distinguished leaders came to see them while they were here. Our beloved Speaker, Mr. RAYBURN, the beloved former Speaker, Mr. MARTIN, the distinguished floor leader, Mr. McCORMACK, Mr. ROONEY, and Mr. BOLAND of the Appropriations Committee, Mrs. GUERITE STITT CHURCH, and others fine talks to them.

For almost 10 years I have asked for recognition of the Irish teachers in the various U.S. cultural exchange programs. To me the rich cultural heritage of the Irish, coupled with an appreciation of their zealous devotion to freedom has made me feel that there is a spiritual tie as well as a personal tie between the Irish people and our own. We love their Tom Moore, we love the early legends, the music and the drama of the Irish, and we do appreciate that in every line of poetry, in every note of music, in every line of drama, there is written a deep appreciation of beauty, even in gray sky, of hope in adversity, of faith in a closeness to God. We need the close tie with these people because we share each other's devotion to freedom. We admire the deep courage and loyalty of the Irish people.

The teachers who came decided to come to the United States for a vacation and to study our schools, as well as various other activities in this country. They paid their own expenses, and they have been the guests of the State Department and of the U.S. Office of Education since they arrived.

They were a most delightful group, all handsome, intelligent young men and women. It was a joy to have known them.

We plan to have a group of teachers from the United States study in Ireland and have more Irish teachers come here and study with us.

The following is a list of some of the people who came to the luncheon that I held in their honor. I hope that every Member of Congress will meet them while they are here. They will be here for about a week. I will give later a list of the names and the teachers who came here, they may have distant relatives and friends in this country. And my colleagues may have friends or relatives in Ireland that they want to send messages to.

May God give them a safe return to their country and a happy experience with us and the hope they will come back to us.

YEGHIA JUKNAVORIAN

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I want to read part of a letter from the U.S. Attorney for the District of Massachusetts regarding a man named Yeghia Juknavorian who died recently, making the Treasury of the United States the beneficiary to the extent of \$500 under his life insurance policy. The reasons for his doing this

August 4

13806

are set out in a handwritten document which he turned over to his attorney in 1954, and I shall simply read part of it, as follows:

I came to this country in 1910. At that time I was dreaming myself. I thought I had died in Turkey and I find myself dragged into heaven—that was my idea of the United States; in 1927, I brought my wife and my daughter from Marseilles, France, but I cannot bring in my son because he was a couple of weeks over 18 years. Then in 1928 my wife got sick. She was operated on and caught pneumonia. Every time I went to the hospital she called for our son "Come on Mike," "Come on Michael," and the next day I went to see Mrs. ROGERS. I told her the story. Mrs. ROGERS told me "I am very sorry but we cannot break the law. He is over 18 years of age. But we will try to bring him here for a 6-month vacation." I said that I was very appreciative. She told me between 3 or 4 days after "I have to go to Washington. Then I am going to telegraph to the American Ambassador in France to allow your son to come for a 6-month vacation." About 3 weeks after that time my son came out here and saw his mother alive. This is worth a million dollars, what Mrs. ROGERS has done. Now thanks to God, I have seven grandchildren—four boys and three girls. One boy is now in Korea, another one enlisted 2 months ago, the other two, 15 and 6 years old. Now this Government doing all this, help the people, save the people.

Mr. Speaker, this is a wonderful letter of appreciation of the United States, together with a gift of \$500 to help keep our country strong and free.

(Mr. LINDSAY (at the request of Mr. GLENN) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

[Mr. LINDSAY'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

LABOR LEGISLATION

(Mr. GRIFFIN (at the request of Mr. GLENN) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, it should be of deep interest to every Member of this body to know the concern with which small businessmen throughout the country view the state of present laws dealing with labor-management relations under which they must try to exist.

Recently I requested Administrator Wendell B. Barnes of the Small Business Administration to furnish me with his views as to the need for effective reform legislation in this field. In particular, I asked for his comments on the substitute bill which the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANDRUM] and I introduced last week.

Mr. Barnes' reply to my inquiry is most enlightening. The text of his letter follows:

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., August 3, 1959.

HON. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. GRIFFIN: I have your letter of July 30, 1959, requesting my personal views concerning the identical bills (H.R. 8400 and H.R. 8401) recently introduced by you and

Congressman LANDRUM to effect the labor reforms which are so essential to correct the shocking abuses exposed by Senator McCLELLAN'S Committee.

Some of these abuses, such as those involving the internal affairs of labor unions, are not of direct concern to the Small Business Administration. Our principal interest lies in the following: (1) the so-called jurisdictional gap; (2) the abuses presently attending organizational picketing; and (3) secondary boycotts.

Early this year, identical bills were introduced in the House by you and Congressman HIESTAND, together with other Republican members, calling for the correction of numerous defects in the labor laws. In a letter addressed to Mr. HIESTAND on June 1, 1959, I emphasized the importance to small business of the three problems described above and explained the effects which I thought his bill (H.R. 3545) would have on them. As you will note, I was satisfied with the provisions of H.R. 3545 dealing with blackmail picketing and secondary boycotts but had some reservations concerning the language of that portion of the bill dealing with the jurisdictional gap.

This is a vital matter. In view of the fact that it cannot possibly handle all labor disputes affecting interstate commerce, the NLRB has found it necessary to decline to exercise jurisdiction in cases of lesser importance. To this end, it has established yardsticks based, directly or indirectly, upon the annual dollar volume of interstate sales and purchases transacted by employers.

An aggrieved employer whose volume is below that set for the type of business in which he is engaged cannot normally obtain a hearing from the Board. Nor can he, under the Supreme Court's interpretation of the law, obtain relief from his State courts. Some 3 million small concerns are caught in this incredible situation, utterly defenseless against the wrongs inflicted upon them by labor unions. These businesses are, for all practical purposes, helpless.

It is imperative that an employer whose volume of interstate business is below that established by the Board for the type of enterprise in which he is engaged should have direct and immediate access to the courts of his State for the settlement of any labor dispute. It should not be necessary, as has been suggested, for him to obtain a specific declination from the Board before obtaining such access. Since the Board normally has a crowded docket, the resulting delay would, in most instances, bring financial ruin to the business concern involved in the dispute, even though the Board eventually declines jurisdiction and even though the small-business owner wins his case. Time is of the essence in these matters.

Section 701 of the Griffin-Landrum bill, concerning the jurisdictional gap, appears to have been drafted with this problem in mind. I prefer its provisions to those made for the jurisdictional gap in the earlier measure sponsored by you, Congressman HIESTAND and others. Similarly, section 705 of the bill deals effectively with blackmail picketing and secondary boycotts.

The introduction of the Griffin-Landrum proposal has done much to lessen the dismay felt by all friends of small business at the unbelievably weak bill (H.R. 8342) approved by the House Committee on Education and Labor. The blunt truth is that the latter measure contains nothing whatsoever to remedy, or even to alleviate, the three problems described above. That bill can be supported only by turning one's back on the small businesses of the Nation.

As I told Congressman HIESTAND, there are some 27 million people in the small-business community, owners and unorganized employees, who are the principal victims of the deficiencies in existing law. They are closely

watching this legislation. They expect their interests to be protected by Congress, notwithstanding the efforts of some labor leaders to thwart remedial action.

In behalf of small business, I thank you, Mr. LANDRUM, Mr. HIESTAND and the others who are making a splendid effort to establish justice in the field of labor-management relations.

Sincerely yours,
WENDELL B. BARNES,
Administrator.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. SCHERER, for August 4, 5, and 6, on account of hearings of the Committee on Un-American Activities in New York City.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. SIKES, for 20 minutes, on August 6.
Mr. FEIGHAN, for 30 minutes, today, and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona, for 60 minutes, on tomorrow.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, for 20 minutes, on tomorrow.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. LANGEN and to include a statement.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. VAN ZANDT in five instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania in five instances, in each to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts, to extend her remarks on the Department of Defense appropriation bill conference report.

Mr. CORBETT.
(At the request of Mr. GLENN, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. HOLT in four instances.

Mr. BRAY in two instances.

Mrs. DWYER in five instances.

Mr. SCHWENGEL.

Mr. WALLHAUSER.

Mr. QUIE.

Mr. MICHEL.

Mr. WESTLAND.

(At the request of Mr. KING of Utah, and to include extraneous matter, the following:)

Mr. FLOOD in five instances.

Mr. DINGELL in two instances.

Mr. MULTER in two instances.

Mr. HERLONG.

Mr. BREEDING.

Mr. KEOGH.

Mr. ROOSEVELT.

Mr. MADDEN in two instances.

Mr. BARR.

Mr. EDMONDSON.